

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CHARLES WILLIAMS, M.D.,)
Plaintiff,) 2:09-CV-00554-PMP-PAL
v.) O R D E R
UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER OF)
SOUTHERN NEVADA; JOHN)
ELLERTON, M.D.; BOARD OF)
TRUSTEES OF UMC; RORY REID;)
STEVE SISOLAK; TOM COLLINS;)
LARRY BROWN; LAWRENCE)
WEEKLY; CHRIS GIUNCHIGLIANI;)
SUSAN BRAGER; and MEDICAL AND)
DENTAL STAFF OF THE UNIVERSITY)
MEDICAL CENTER OF SOUTHERN)
NEVADA,
Defendants.)

Presently before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on
Claims One, Ten, Eleven, Twelve, and Thirteen (Doc. #96), filed on March 11, 2010.
Plaintiff filed an Opposition (Doc. #103) on April 5, 2010. Defendants filed a Reply (Doc.
#109) on April 22, 2010.

Also before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of Order Striking
Certain Claims Against Certain Defendants (Doc. #102), filed on April 2, 2010.
Defendants filed a Response (Doc. #122) on July 26, 2010.

///

1 Also before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Doc.
2 #105), filed on April 8, 2010. Defendants filed a Response (Doc. #112) on April 26, 2010.
3 Plaintiff filed a Reply (Doc. #113) on May 6, 2010.

4 The Court held a hearing on these motions on July 26, 2010. (Mins. of
5 Proceedings (Doc. #123).) The Court previously has set forth the factual predicate for this
6 case in prior Orders, and the Court will not repeat those facts here except where necessary
7 to resolve the pending motions.

8 **I. DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON CLAIMS ONE,
9 TEN, ELEVEN, TWELVE, AND THIRTEEN (Doc. #96)**

10 Defendants move for summary judgment on Plaintiff Charles Williams'
11 ("Williams") claims in counts 1 (due process), 10 (negligence), 11 (defamation), 12
12 (defamation per se), and 13 (libel) as barred by the statute of limitations. Defendants
13 contend each of Williams' remaining claims is governed by the two-year limitations period
14 in Nevada Revised Statutes § 11.190, including his federal claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983,
15 which borrows the state limitations period for personal injuries.

16 Williams responds that his constitutional claim has not accrued for limitations
17 purposes because it is a continuing tort. Williams contends that because he was suspended
18 and lost his privileges in violation of his due process rights, and that has not been corrected,
19 and the National Practitioner Data Bank ("NPDB") report remains available and is
20 accessed on a regular basis by hospitals and insurance companies, the due process violation
21 is continuing and has not accrued for limitations purposes. Williams also argues
22 Defendants waived the limitations defense by delaying his fair hearing date and then
23 delaying in filing the administrative record with the state court. Williams also argues he is
24 entitled to equitable tolling. As to his defamation claim, Williams argues each time
25 someone accesses the NPDB it counts as a new publication, and his report has been
26 accessed within the limitations period.

1 A two-year limitations period applies to each of Williams' claims in counts 1
2 (due process), 10 (negligence), 11 (defamation), 12 (defamation per se), and 13 (libel). See
3 Nev. Rev. Stat. § 11.190(4)(e); Cholla Ready Mix, Inc. v. Civish, 382 F.3d 969, 974 (9th
4 Cir. 2004) (adopting state personal injury limitations period for § 1983 claims). Defendant
5 University Medical Center's ("UMC") Board of Trustees ("Board") denied Williams' final
6 appeal on February 21, 2006. Williams filed his Complaint in this action on March 23,
7 2009. Consequently, Williams filed his Complaint well beyond the two year limitations
8 period for any of Defendants' conduct. His claims therefore are barred absent some
9 accrual, waiver, tolling, or other rule to extend the limitations period.

10 **A. Continuing Tort**

11 When a tort involves continuing wrongful conduct, the statute of limitations does
12 not begin to run until the conduct ends. Flowers v. Carville, 310 F.3d 1118, 1126 (9th Cir.
13 2002). A continuing tort exists when no single incident fairly or realistically can be
14 identified as the cause of significant harm to the plaintiff. Id. "A continuing violation is
15 occasioned by continual unlawful acts, not by continual ill effects from an original
16 violation." Ward v. Caulk, 650 F.2d 1144, 1147 (9th Cir. 1981).

17 Plaintiff's remaining claims are not continuing torts. Each violation is discrete.
18 For example, the failure to give adequate notice in the initial summary suspension was
19 complete at the time it was done. Likewise, the failure to turn over documents to permit
20 Williams to prepare adequately for his fair hearing, while perhaps continuous for a while,
21 ended at the fair hearing because he was damaged at that point by his alleged inability to
22 prepare for the hearing without the documents. Even if Defendants' course of conduct
23 throughout the disciplinary proceedings up to and including the Board's decision could be
24 considered continuing conduct, the Board issued its decision on February 21, 2006.
25 Plaintiff filed his Complaint in this case more than two years after that date. At bottom,
26 Williams is complaining about the continuing effects of Defendants' acts, i.e., his inability

1 to obtain employment in the medical field due to the continued existence of the NPDB
2 report, not continuing acts by Defendants. Defendants have not done anything, other than
3 defend litigation, since February 2006. Williams' claims are not continuing torts.

4 **B. Waiver**

5 "Waiver is the intentional relinquishment of a known right with knowledge of its
6 existence and the intent to relinquish it." A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d
7 1004, 1026 (9th Cir. 2001). Williams has not shown that Defendants waived the statute of
8 limitations defense by delaying his fair hearing date or by delaying the filing of the
9 administrative record with the state court. Even assuming Defendants engaged in this
10 conduct, Williams does not explain how either act constitutes a waiver of a statute of
11 limitations defense in relation to the claims Williams now pursues in this action.

12 However, the Court concludes Defendants have waived the statute of limitations
13 defense for Williams' § 1983 claim. When a party moves for final summary judgment on
14 an issue, the nonmoving party must raise in their opposition all arguments or defenses
15 which would preclude judgment in the moving party's favor or else the nonmoving party
16 abandons the argument or defense. Case v. Eslinger, 555 F.3d 1317, 1329 (11th Cir. 2009);
17 Johnson v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Ga., 263 F.3d 1234, 1264 (11th Cir. 2001); Diversey
18 Lever, Inc. v. Ecolab, Inc., 191 F.3d 1350, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 1999); United Mine Workers of
19 Am. 1974 Pension v. Pittston Co., 984 F.2d 469, 478 (D.C. 1993). But see Long v. Howard
20 Univ., 550 F.3d 21, 24-25 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (holding statute of limitations defense "can be
21 raised at trial so long as it was properly asserted in the answer and not thereafter
22 affirmatively waived," and distinguishing United Mine Workers by asserting the defendant
23 in that case waived its defense from the beginning by failing to assert the defense in a
24 pleading or motion). As the Eleventh Circuit stated, a party "cannot readily complain about
25 the entry of a summary judgment order that did not consider an argument they chose not to
26 develop for the district court at the time of the summary judgment motions." Case, 555

1 F.3d at 1329.

2 Williams previously moved for summary judgment on his § 1983 claim.
3 Defendants did not raise the statute of limitations as a possible defense in their opposition to
4 that motion. The Court granted partial summary judgment to Williams on this claim. Now,
5 after having received an unfavorable result, Defendants want to raise the statute of
6 limitations defense to bar the claim. Defendants should have raised their affirmative
7 defense in response to the motion for summary judgment, but did not. The Court could
8 have granted complete summary judgment to Williams on the § 1983 claim on the prior
9 round of briefing. Had Defendants then moved for reconsideration on the basis of the
10 statute of limitations, the Court would have denied such a motion because Defendants
11 could, and should, have raised the limitations argument in response to Williams' motion.
12 Defendants therefore waived their statute of limitations defense on Williams' § 1983 claim.

13 C. Equitable Tolling

14 Nevada's rules on equitable tolling apply to Williams' state law claims and his
15 § 1983 claim. See Lucchesi v. Bar-O Boys Ranch, 353 F.3d 691, 694 (9th Cir. 2003)
16 ("State law governs the statutes of limitations for section 1983 actions as well as questions
17 regarding the tolling of such limitations periods."). The Nevada Supreme Court has stated
18 that "the purpose of statutory time limitations for judicial review is to prevent stale issues
19 from being raised against a party." Seino v. Employers Ins. Co. of Nev., 111 P.3d 1107,
20 1112 (Nev. 2005). Nevada permits the use of equitable tolling "in situations where the
21 danger of prejudice to the defendant is absent, and the interests of justice so require." Id.
22 (alteration and quotation omitted). Nevada considers the following factors to determine
23 whether equitable tolling is appropriate: the plaintiff's diligence; the plaintiff's knowledge
24 of the relevant facts; the plaintiff's reliance on authoritative statements that misled the
25 plaintiff about the nature of his rights; any deception or false assurances by the defendant;
26 the prejudice to the defendant that actually would result; and "any other equitable

1 considerations appropriate in the particular case.” Id. Nevada has tolled limitations periods
2 where the plaintiff was pursuing the same issues in another court or administrative
3 proceedings, but only where the party was required to proceed in the other forum, and the
4 law favored resolution in that forum. Siragusa v. Brown, 971 P.2d 801, 808 n.7 (Nev.
5 1998).

6 Williams has not been diligent about pursuing his claims asserted in the present
7 litigation, which he filed two years beyond the limitations period. Williams does not
8 identify anything that would have precluded his bringing suit in this Court while
9 simultaneously pursuing his appeal of the Board’s decision in state court. Williams’
10 knowledge of the facts also weighs against equitable tolling. Williams has known about
11 Defendants’ conduct, both as to discrete acts and the overall course of conduct, since no
12 later than the Board’s decision in February 2006. Williams has not claimed he relied on any
13 authoritative statements that misled him about the nature of his rights. He also has not
14 identified any deception or false assurances by Defendants, beyond their failure to turn over
15 certain documents. However, Williams was aware of Defendants’ refusal to turn over
16 documents a long time ago and that in no way misled him as to the running of the
17 limitations period. Defendants do not identify any prejudice that would result from tolling
18 other than they have a right to closure. However, that prejudice is not insignificant.

19 Viewing all the equitable tolling factors, the Court concludes that equitable
20 tolling is not appropriate. Williams knew all relevant facts well before the statute of
21 limitations expired, yet did not file suit until two years after the limitations period ran, and
22 he has identified no equitable considerations that would serve to extend the limitations
23 period under the applicable test in Nevada.

24 **D. Multiple Publications of the NPDB Report**

25 Nevada has not addressed whether it would apply the “single publication rule.”
26 That rule provides that any one edition of a magazine or newspaper is a single publication

1 and gives rise to only one cause of action for defamation, with a “statute of limitations
 2 period that runs from the point at which the original dissemination occurred.” Canatella v.
 3 Van De Kamp, 486 F.3d 1128, 1133 (9th Cir. 2007); Oja v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs,
 4 440 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2006). “Where the state’s highest court has not decided an
 5 issue, the task of the federal courts is to predict how the state high court would resolve it.”
 6 Giles v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp., 494 F.3d 865, 872 (9th Cir. 2007) (quotation
 7 omitted). “In answering that question, this court looks for ‘guidance’ to decisions by
 8 intermediate appellate courts of the state and by courts in other jurisdictions.” Id.
 9 (quotation omitted).

10 The Court concludes Nevada likely would follow other jurisdictions in adopting
 11 the single publication rule, given its logic that a single publication of a magazine or
 12 newspaper gives rise to one cause of action, rather than a cause of action for every
 13 individual magazine or newspaper distributed. The rule “is designed to protect defendants
 14 from harassment through multiple suits and to reduce the drain of libel cases on judicial
 15 resources.” Oja, 440 F.3d at 1131. Additionally, Nevada likely would follow the
 16 Restatement (Second) of Torts § 577A, which sets forth the single publication rule.
 17 However, it adds the caveat that the rule:

18 does not include separate aggregate publications on different
 19 occasions. Thus if the same defamatory statement is published in the
 20 morning and evening editions of a newspaper, each edition is a
 21 separate single publication and there are two causes of action. The
 22 same is true of a rebroadcast of the defamation over radio or television
 23 or a second run of a motion picture on the same evening. In these
 24 cases the publication reaches a new group and the repetition justifies a
 25 new cause of action. The justification for this conclusion usually
 26 offered is that in these cases the second publication is intended to and
 does reach a new group.

24 Restatement (Second) Torts § 577A cmt. d.

25 The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has concluded that the
 26 single publication rule should apply to internet postings as the functional equivalent of

1 traditional print media. Although noting some differences, including the ability of the
2 internet poster to take down the offending web posting in a way not possible in traditional
3 print media, the Ninth Circuit concluded that—

4 Internet publication is a form of “aggregate communication” in that it
5 is intended for a broad, public audience, similar to print media. In both
6 print and Internet publishing, information is generally considered
7 “published” when it is made available to the public. Once information
has been published on a website or print media, there is no further act
required by the publisher to make the information available to the
public.

8 Oja, 440 F.3d at 1130-31. The Ninth Circuit concluded the single publication rule made
9 sense for internet postings because, due to the sheer number of internet users and the ability
10 to post something for public consumption for an indefinite period of time, “allowing
11 Internet publications to be subject to a multiple publication rule would implicate an even
12 greater potential for endless retrIGGERING of the statute of limitations, multiplicity of suits
13 and harassment of defendants,” and would inhibit the free and open dissemination of
14 information on the internet. Id.

15 In Oja, the plaintiff argued that an agency’s website posting that divulged
16 personal information about him in violation of the Privacy Act which generally was
17 accessible to anyone is similar to members of the public serially calling the defendant and
18 being told the defamatory information, and thus should not be subject to the single
19 publication rule. The Ninth Circuit rejected the plaintiff’s argument, concluding that the
20 “actual posting or publishing of information onto a website requires only a single, discrete
21 act, and no additional action by the host is necessary before the information may be
22 accessed by the general public. Thus, unlike a series of telephone calls, once a host posts
23 information on the Internet, the host may remain passive and does not have to respond anew
24 each time an Internet user accesses its website.” Id. at 1132.

25 The Oja Court also distinguished a case upon which Williams relies, Swafford v.
26 Memphis Individual Practice Association, No. 02A01-9612-CV-00311, 1998 WL 281935

(Tenn. Ct. App. 1998) (unpublished). Swafford involved an NPDB report which provided allegedly defamatory information to health care entities requesting the information from the data bank. The Swafford court concluded the single publication rule did not apply “because each time a certified entity directly requested the information from the electronic data-bank held by the NPDB, the NPDB itself provided the information directly to the requesting entity.” Id. (citing Swafford, 1998 WL 281935 at *8). Swafford compared the NPDB to credit report cases where someone makes a false report to a credit reporting agency, which then publishes that information when it receives a specific request. As set forth in Swafford, courts have not applied the single publication rule in such cases, finding that each discrete request is a new publication to a new audience. Swafford, 1998 WL 281935 at

*6-8. The Oja Court distinguished Swafford as follows:

Swafford is distinguishable from our present concern, and is not inconsistent with application of the single publication rule to the vast majority of Internet publications. Unlike a typical Internet publication, the information at issue in Swafford was not available for the general public to access, nor could any unregistered and non-specific entities access the registered databank. Given the exclusive and controlled access to the NPDB “pay-to-play” databank, the release of the offending information could hardly be considered an “aggregate communication” comparable to typical Internet publication, where access is generally available to anyone at any time. Indeed, the limited access scenario set forth in Swafford resembles Oja’s telephone call analogy where the agency releases the information anew each time there is a request. Swafford is much more akin to the release of personal credit reports by those agencies that track and compile credit information; in such cases, it has been widely accepted that the transmission or publication of the information does not warrant application of the single publication rule, and each transmission or publication is actionable.

Id. at 1133; see also Canatella, 486 F.3d at 1136 (also distinguishing Swafford because the plaintiff’s information was widely available to the general public on the webpage, even if the public had to perform a search on his name to find it).

The Court concludes that in addition to adopting the single publication rule, Nevada also would follow Oja, Swafford, and the Restatement’s comment regarding the

1 difference between general internet publishing and a second publication of the same
2 information to a new audience. A report to the NPDB database is not the same as a single
3 edition of a newspaper. It can be accessed only by a select group of individuals and only
4 upon their request. It is not widely and generally available and thus is not a single,
5 aggregate publication. Each time the information is released to a requester, it is published
6 anew.

7 Defendants have a nonfrivolous argument that Williams can trigger future
8 publications by applying to hospitals who then would request the NPDB report, and thereby
9 increase damages and re-trigger the limitations period. But Defendants can remove the
10 posting or modify it at any time, and thus can control whether the information is published
11 to future requesters. Defendants thus can avoid the concerns of increased liability and
12 continuous resetting of the statute of limitations that underlie the single publication rule.
13 Additionally, once the issue of whether the NPDB report is defamatory is resolved, either
14 Defendants may remove or modify the report if it is found to be defamatory, or Williams
15 will not be able to bring future claims based on the report due to issue preclusion if it is
16 found not to be defamatory. Moreover, this same argument could apply in the credit report
17 situation, where a plaintiff could trigger requests for his credit history by taking actions
18 which would induce third parties to request his credit history. However, courts have not
19 applied the single publication rule to that analogous situation.

20 Williams has presented evidence that the NPDB report has been accessed within
21 the last two years. Consequently, Williams' defamation claims are timely for any requests
22 made for the NPDB report within two years of the filing of the Complaint.

23 In sum, the Court will grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment based on
24 the statute of limitations as to count 10 (negligence), and counts 11 (defamation), 12
25 (defamation per se), and 13 (libel) for any defamatory publications prior to two years before
26 the filing of the Complaint. The Court will deny Defendants' motion as to count 1 (due

1 process) and counts 11 (defamation), 12 (defamation per se), and 13 (libel) for any
2 defamatory publications within two years of the filing of the Complaint.

3 **II. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER STRIKING
CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST CERTAIN DEFENDANTS (Doc. #102)**

5 Williams seeks reconsideration of the Court's prior Order (Doc. #90) granting
6 summary judgment in favor of Defendants UMC and the Board on count one, and the Board
7 for counts eleven, twelve, and thirteen. Williams further requests the Court grant summary
8 judgment in favor of Williams on his due process claim against UMC and the Board.
9 Williams argues the Court's prior Order was based on a lack of evidence that the Board and
10 UMC participated in the due process violations. Williams contends he now has evidence he
11 raised the due process violations to the Board, and thus he has established the Board's
12 participation in the constitutional violation. Williams contends the Court thus not only
13 should reconsider its prior ruling, it should enter partial summary judgment in favor of
14 Williams on count one against the Board and UMC. Williams also argues he has evidence
15 the Anesthesia Committee declined to take action against Williams and was going to
16 conduct further investigation on the same day the NPDB report was sent to the data bank.
17 Williams requests the Court reconsider the grant of summary judgment as to the Board on
18 the defamation claims.

19 Defendants respond that Williams has not presented new evidence because it was
20 within Williams' knowledge as to whether he presented his due process arguments to the
21 Board. Williams thus could and should have presented that evidence and argument
22 previously.

23 **A. Count One**

24 The Court will not reconsider its prior Order on count one as to UMC and the
25 Board. Williams contends Defendants have not provided him with all documents in
26 discovery, and he only recently received from Defendants the background statement he

1 presented to the Board prior to the Board's final decision which shows he raised the due
2 process violations to the Board. Even assuming Defendants failed to turn over the
3 document upon which Williams now relies, this information was within Williams'
4 knowledge. Williams would know whether he presented certain arguments to the Board,
5 and he could have filed an affidavit in support of his arguments. Williams could and should
6 have presented this evidence in response to Defendants' summary judgment motion, but
7 failed to do so. The Court therefore will deny Williams' motion to reconsider the Court's
8 prior Order as to count one.

9 **B. Defamation Counts**

10 Williams also seeks reconsideration of the grant of summary judgment as to the
11 Board in relation to the defamation counts. Williams contends he has new evidence in the
12 form of minutes from the meeting of the Anesthesia Committee which show the Committee
13 wanted to conduct further investigation into the issues surrounding Williams' suspension.
14 That same day, the NPDB report was filed even though the Committee had not completed
15 an investigation or recommended any action. Williams does not explain how the
16 Anesthesia Committee meeting minutes overcome the Court's prior ruling that Williams
17 failed to present evidence of personal participation by the Board or that the Board acted
18 with actual malice. The Court will deny the motion to reconsider with respect to the
19 defamation counts.

20 **III. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Doc. #105)**

21 Williams argues that based on the Court's prior Orders, he now is entitled to
22 summary judgment on his claims for negligence per se (count 10), breach of the covenant of
23 good faith and fair dealing (count 9), and defamation claims (counts 11, 12, 13).
24 Defendants respond that issues of fact remain as to each claim.

25 ///

26 ///

1 **A. Negligence Per Se (Count 10)**

2 Williams argues Defendants' violation of the Bylaws satisfies the duty and
3 breach elements of negligence, and no genuine issue of material fact remains that
4 Defendants' failure to comply with the Bylaws caused him damages. Defendants respond
5 that genuine issues of material fact remain as to breach and causation.

6 Because this claim is barred by the statute of limitations, as discussed above, the
7 Court will deny Williams' motion for summary judgment on this claim. Even if this claim
8 were not barred, genuine issues of material fact remain as to causation. Williams contends
9 that if he had been provided proper notice and given all documents as required, he would
10 have been able to defend himself better. He notes that when he was able to fully defend
11 himself by the state medical board, that body took no action against him. However, that he
12 did not have his license to practice medicine revoked does not necessarily mean that
13 Defendants still might not have made the same substantive decisions about his privileges at
14 UMC if they had followed the Bylaws' procedural requirements. Whether the result would
15 have been different is a jury question. The Court will deny Williams' motion for summary
16 judgment on this claim.

17 **B. Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing (Count 9)**

18 Williams argues he entered into an enforceable contract with Defendants and
19 Defendants breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by filing the
20 NPDB report and failing to provide evidence to support it, failing to amend the NPDB
21 report after Williams identified a problem with it, using "word on the street" evidence
22 relating to alleged drug use, considering drug abuse and wastage even though later denying
23 it was a factor in any decisions, delaying the fair hearing, disrupting Williams' presentation
24 of evidence at the fair hearing, moving forward despite the Anesthesia Committee's
25 incomplete investigation, faxing new evidence to Williams the day of the fair hearing,
26 raising allegations relating to Williams' privileges application at the hearing, delaying

1 notice of the fair hearing date, and withholding documents as privileged when they were
2 not.

3 Defendants respond that the Court already ruled in its decision on Defendants'
4 prior summary judgment motion that genuine issues of fact remain as to whether Williams
5 and Defendants entered into a contract. Defendants also argue the alleged conduct
6 Williams sets forth do not arise to a breach of the covenant, and in any event, there are
7 issues of fact as to the alleged conduct.

8 Under Nevada law, whether an enforceable contract was formed is a question of
9 fact. Whitemaine v. Aniskovich, 183 P.3d 137, 141 (Nev. 2008). Consequently, the Court
10 previously ruled on Defendants' motion for summary judgment that a fact issue remained as
11 to whether the parties formed a contract through the grant of privileges which incorporated
12 the Bylaws. Further, issues of fact remain as to whether Defendants breached the implied
13 covenant of good faith and fair dealing. Whether a party acted in good faith is a fact
14 question. Mitchell v. Bailey & Selover, Inc., 605 P.2d 1138, 1139 (Nev. 1980). Viewing
15 the facts in the light most favorable to Defendants, a reasonable jury could conclude the acts
16 to which Williams refers do not amount to a breach of the covenant of good faith and fair
17 dealing. Moreover, Defendants dispute Williams' characterizations of the alleged conduct.
18 The Court will deny Williams' motion on this claim.

19 **C. Defamation (Counts 11-13)**

20 Williams moves for summary judgment on his defamation claims, arguing no
21 genuine issue of fact remains that the NPDB report was false, made with malice, and caused
22 him damages. Defendants respond that issues of fact remain as to falsity and malice.

23 The Court will deny Williams' motion. Under Nevada law, it is a question for
24 the Court as to whether a statement is capable of a defamatory construction. Posadas v.
25 City of Reno, 851 P.2d 438, 442 (Nev. 1993). However, if a statement is "capable of
26 different constructions, one of which is defamatory, resolution of the ambiguity is a

1 question of fact for the jury.” Id. The NPDB report is ambiguous and the Court already
2 determined it is capable of a defamatory construction. Resolution of whether it is in fact
3 defamatory is now a jury question.

4 Moreover, factual questions remain as to whether Defendants acted with actual
5 malice. Actual malice is a subjective inquiry into the defendant’s belief regarding the
6 statement’s truthfulness. Nev. Independ. Broad. Corp. v. Allen, 664 P.3d 337, 344 (Nev.
7 1983). While Williams has presented evidence raising an issue of fact on actual malice
8 sufficient to defeat Defendants’ prior motion for summary judgment, viewing the facts in
9 the light most favorable to Defendants, a reasonable jury could find in Defendants’ favor.
10 The Court therefore will deny Williams’ motion for summary judgment on the defamation
11 claims.

12 **IV. CONCLUSION**

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants’ Motion for Summary
14 Judgment on Claims One, Ten, Eleven, Twelve, and Thirteen (Doc. #96) is hereby
15 GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The motion is granted as to Plaintiff’s negligence
16 claim in count ten, and as to Plaintiff’s defamation claims in counts eleven, twelve, and
17 thirteen for any publications occurring more than two years prior to the filing of the
18 Complaint. The motion is denied in all other respects.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration of
20 Order Striking Certain Claims Against Certain Defendants (Doc. #102) is hereby DENIED.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary
22 Judgment (Doc. #105) is hereby DENIED.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall file the proposed joint pretrial
2 order within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

3
4 DATED: July 28, 2010

5 
6 PHILIP M. PRO
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26